

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTOPHER JOHN WILSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
TUOLOMNE COUNTY, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:21-cv-00196-KES-SKO (PC)
**ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S
FILING OF NOVEMBER 21, 2025**
(Doc. 95)

Plaintiff Christopher John Wilson, a state prisoner and previous county detainee, is proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action. This action proceeds on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference to serious medical needs and failure to protect claims against Defendant Son and Eighth Amendment excessive force claim against Defendant Teague.

I. BACKGROUND

On September 2, 2025, the Court issued its Order Referring Case to Post-Screening ADR and Staying Case for 120 Days. (Doc. 84.) The parties were directed to file a notice within 45 days indicating whether they wished to participate in an early settlement conference. (*Id.* at 2.) On September 18, 2025, Plaintiff filed notice stating he wished to participate in an early settlement conference. (Doc. 85.) On October 9, 2025, Defendant Teague filed notice stating he did not wish to participate in an early settlement conference. (Doc. 89.) On October 16, 2025,

1 Defendant Son also filed notice indicating he did not wish to participate in an early settlement
2 conference. (Doc. 90.)

3 On October 16, 2025, because all parties did not wish to participate in an early settlement
4 conference, the Court issued its Order Lifting Previously Imposed Stay and Order Directing Clerk
5 of the Court to Issue Discovery and Scheduling Order. (Doc. 91.) The Clerk issued the Discovery
6 and Scheduling Order that same date. (Doc. 92.)

7 On October 27, 2025, Plaintiff filed a document docketed as a “Notice Regarding Early
8 Settlement Conference.” (Doc. 93.) Plaintiff photocopied Defendant Teague’s October 9, 2025,
9 notice and added a check to the “Yes” box. (*Id.* at 1.) Plaintiff included a handwritten page that
10 reads: “Porter Scott. This is to your request of Early Settlement. I will agree to the Amount of ...
11 to Settle upon this Case and Action.” (*Id.* at 2.)

12 On November 21, 2025, Plaintiff filed a document docketed as a “Response to Early
13 Settlement.” (Doc. 95.) In this filing, Plaintiff directs a comment to Defendant Son’s attorneys,
14 stating he has “no problem to Early Settlement Conference” and “no problem [participating by]
15 telephone or video conference” (*Id.* at 1.) Plaintiff photocopied Defendant Son’s October 16,
16 2025, notice and added a check to the “Yes” box. (*Id.* at 2.)

17 **II. DISCUSSION**

18 Participation in an early settlement conference is *voluntary* not mandatory. Because both
19 Defendants Son and Teague opted *not* to participate in an early settlement conference, the Court
20 lifted the stay of these proceedings and directed the Clerk of the Court to issue a Discovery and
21 Scheduling Order. Therefore, no early settlement conference will occur in this action.

22 Plaintiff is advised that this action is now in the discovery phase. The parties may now
23 engage in discovery as outlined in the order issued October 21, 2025. (Doc. 92; *see also* Doc. 5 at
24 4-5 [First Informational Order issued 2/17/2021].) The parties are expected to comply with the
25 deadlines set forth in the scheduling order.

26 Finally, Plaintiff will be directed to avoid filing further notices or responses concerning an
27 early settlement conference.
28

